## BEFORE THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION In the Matter of ) ) CASE CLOSURE UNDER THE **MUR 5966** ) **NEW HAMPSHIRE REPUBLICAN ENFORCEMENT PRIORITY SYSTEM** ) STATE COMMITTEE

## GENERAL COUNSEL'S REPORT

Under the Enforcement Priority System, matters that involve de minimis activity and are deemed inappropriate for review by the Alternative Dispute Resolution Office are forwarded to the Commission with a recommendation for dismissal as an exercise of its prosecutorial discretion.

In this case, the complainant alleges that the New Hampshire Republican State

Committee ("NHRSC") and Robert Scott, in his official capacity as treasurer, provided

copies of its voter file to federal candidates without charge. The complainant alleges that this

activity resulted in unreported in-kind contributions to federal candidates in violation of 2

U.S.C. § 434(b)(4) and contributions in excess of the \$5,000 limitation in violation of 2

U.S.C. § 441a(a)(2), because of the fair market value of such information. The complainant

further alleges that the NHRSC made expenditures for voter identification, as defined at 2

U.S.C. § 431(20)(A)(ii) and 11 C.F.R. § 100.24(a)(4), directly from non-federal accounts

during a time when these activities were required to be paid exclusively with federal funds or

a combination of federal and Levin funds. Specifically, the complaint identifies a payment of

\$436.50 from NHRSC to the New Hampshire Secretary of State on September 29, 2006, five

weeks before the November 2006 elections. Finally, the complaint contends that because the

Case Closure Under EPS – MUR 5966 General Counsel's Report Page 2 of 3

NHRSC did not report any payments for the development of its voter file, the NHRSC may
have received an in-kind contribution from an undisclosed source.

3 In its response, the NHRSC denies that it provided any copies of the voter file to any 4 federal candidate during the 2008 election cycle. An affidavit submitted by Fergus Cullen, 5 the Chairman of the NHRSC, states that, "to date, at no time during the 2008 election cycle has the NHRSC entered into any exchange agreement, sold, leased, or otherwise provided 6 7 any federal candidate with a New Hampshire voter file." As to the second allegation 8 concerning NHRSC expenditures for voter identification, the response admits that the 9 NHRSC may have inadvertently purchased a voter file from the New Hampshire Secretary of 10 State on September 29, 2006 with non-federal funds. In order to correct the oversight, the 11 NHRSC reimbursed its state account in the amount of \$436.50 and filed an amended report 12 with the Commission.

It appears that the total amount at issue in this matter is \$436.50. Accordingly, in light of the de minimis nature of the allegations presented in MUR 5966, and in furtherance of the Commission's priorities and resources, relative to other matters pending on the Enforcement docket, the Office of General Counsel believes that the Commission should exercise its prosecutorial discretion and dismiss this matter. See Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821 (1985). Additionally, this Office recommends that the NHRSC be admonished for its conduct in this matter.

1

31

## **RECOMMENDATION**

2 The Office of General Counsel recommends that the Commission dismiss 3 MUR 5966, admonish the New Hampshire Republican State Committee, close the file effective two weeks from the date of the Commission vote, and approve the appropriate 5 letters. Thomasenia P. Duncan 8 General Counsel 9 10 11 BY: Gregory R. Baker 12 13 Special Counsel Complaints Examination 14 15 & Legal Administration 16 17 18 19 Jeff,S, Jordan Supervisory Attorney 20 21 **Complaints Examination** 22 & Legal Administration 23 24 Kasey Morgenheim 25 26 27 Attorney 28 29 Attachment: Narrative in MUR 5966 **30** 

1 2 3

**MUR 5966** 

Complainant: New Hampshire Democratic Party

8 Respondent:

New Hampshire Republican State Committee and

Robert Scott, as treasurer

**Alk** 12 Cor

Allegations: The complainant alleges that the New Hampshire Republican State Committee ("NHRSC") provided copies of its voter file to federal candidates without charge. The complainant alleges that this activity resulted in unreported in-kind contributions to federal candidates in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 434(b)(4) and contributions in excess of the \$5,000 limitation in violation of 2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(2), because of the fair market value of such information. The complainant further alleges that the NHRSC made expenditures for voter identification, as defined at 2 U.S.C. § 431(20)(A)(ii) and 11 C.F.R. § 100.24(a)(4), directly from non-federal accounts during a time when these activities were required to be paid exclusively with federal funds or a combination of federal and Levin funds. Specifically, the complaint identifies a payment of \$436.50 from NHRSC to the New Hampshire Secretary of State on September 29, 2006, five weeks before the November 2006 elections. Finally, the complaint contends that because the NHRSC did not report any payments for the development of its voter file, the NHRSC may have received an in-kind contribution from an undisclosed source.

Response: In its response, the NHRSC denies that it provided any copies of the voter file to any federal candidate during the 2008 election cycle. An affidavit submitted by Fergus Cullen, the Chairman of the NHRSC, states that, "to date, at no time during the 2008 election cycle has the NHRSC entered into any exchange agreement, sold, leased, or otherwise provided any federal candidate with a New Hampshire voter file." As to the second allegation, concerning NHRSC expenditures for voter identification, the response admits that the NHRSC may have inadvertently purchased a voter file from the New Hampshire Secretary of State on September 29, 2006 with non-federal funds. In order to correct the oversight, the NHRSC reimbursed its state account in the amount of \$436.50 and filed an amended report with the Commission.

General Counsel's Note: It appears that the total amount at issue in this matter is \$436.50. this Office believes that in light of the de minimis nature of the allegations presented the Commission should exercise its prosecutorial discretion and dismiss this matter and send an admonishment to the NHRSC.

Date complaint filed: January 22, 2008

Date response filed: March 6, 2008